



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*[Handwritten signature]*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/765,160

01/28/2004

Haruo Yoshida

248138US6

2145

22850 7590 01/04/2008  
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

COLEMAN, VANESSA V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2627

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/04/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 10/765,160	Applicant(s) YOSHIDA ET AL.	
	Examiner Vanessa (Brandi) Coleman	Art Unit 2627	

**All Participants:**

(1) Vanessa (Brandi) Coleman.

(2) Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D..

**Status of Application: Pending**

(3) Craig Renner.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 27 December 2007

**Time:** 4:15

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*1*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
**CRAIG A. RENNER**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Regarding claim 1, the nature of the relationship between the "flag indicating a recording state of a content file," recited in lines 6-7, and the "flag indicating invalidity," recited in line 10 was discussed to clarify applicant's intentions.



**CRAIG A. RENNER**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**